Attorney Docket No.: 209406-84004 (formerly 65072-0145)

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-18 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 10 are amended. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following Remarks.

1. The Office action rejects Claims 1, 4, 10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Peiffer (U.S. Patent No. 5,064,407, hereinafter "Peiffer"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 10 are amended to include the feature that the carrier has a moisture content below 10%. This feature was inadvertently omitted from the originally filed Claim 1 in response to the Office action dated February 8, 2005 (Paper No. 200502025). canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot. It is respectfully submitted that at least this feature is not disclosed, taught or suggested in Peiffer, and therefore, the rejection is misplaced.

For at least this reason, Claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the applied art. Claim 4, which depends from Claim 1, and Claims 12 and 13, which depend from Claim 10, are likewise allowable over the applied art. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office action rejects Claims 5-9 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Peiffer, and further in view of Dickey (U.S. Patent No. 4,519,340, hereinafter "Dickey"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 14-18 depend from Claim 10. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 10 are amended to include the feature that the carrier has a moisture content below 10%. As mentioned above, there is no mention in Peiffer of at least this feature. Dickey adds nothing to overcome this shortcoming in Peiffer. Thus, the combination of Peiffer and Dickey does not include all the claim limitations, as recited in Claims 1 and 10, and the Office action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. See MPEP §2143.

For at least this reason, Claims 5-9 and 14-18 are allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Should Examiner Le believe anything further would be desirable in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

It is believed that any additional fees due with respect to this paper have already been identified. However, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper, permission is given to charge account number 50-3145 in the name of Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 27, 2005

Customer No. 44200

Tel. No.: (248) 566-8508

SIGNATURE OF PRACTIFIONER

Peter J. Rashid, Reg. No. 39,464

Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP

32270 Telegraph Road

Suite 225

Bingham Farms, MI 48025-2457

Attorney for Applicants

SHATLEND SESSES